Topographical Comedy in the Seventeenth Century

AND

A Restoration "Improvement" of *Doctor Faustus*

A Portion of

ASPECTS OF ENGLISH REALISTIC COMEDY IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY IN CONFORMITY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1936

BY

RICHARD HENRY PERKINSON

BALTIMORE

1937

Topographical Comedy in the Seventeenth Century

AND

A Restoration "Improvement" of *Doctor Faustus*

A Portion of

ASPECTS OF ENGLISH REALISTIC COMEDY
IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY IN CONFORMITY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1936

BY

RICHARD HENRY PERKINSON

BALTIMORE
1937

R. UNIV.
BIBLIOTHEEK
LEIDEN

CONTENTS

I. Introduction

II. Reaction and Baroque Realism

III. Realistic Types and Motifs: Jonson to Congreve

1. The use of Type Characters
2. The Widow
3. The Rake
4. The Marrying Courtezan
5. The Fop
6. The Country Bumpkin
7. The Captain
8. Lights that Failed: the Puritan and the Miser

IV. The Topographical Comedy

V. Literature and Restoration Life

Appendix A: A List of Comedies with Type Characters

Appendix B: A Restoration "Improvement" of *Doctor Faustus*

Bibliography

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41547016_0096

SUMMARY

An examination of critical opinions on the continuity of English comedy in the seventeenth century shows a large element of contradiction. Restoration comedy is said to derive from France, from contemporary society, or from the earlier English stage. The obvious character of Restoration comedy is its realism which is found to be a development natural to later renaissance art and literature. A selection of characters which are thought characteristic of Restoration comedy and life is made; these are found also in the realistic comedy of the Jacobean and Caroline theatres, and are traced through the drama from Jonson to Congreve in a numerous and unbroken series modified only by popular tastes. Restoration dramatists accepted and used these type characters in their most notable comedies.

Topographical comedy, a particular genre of the Restoration theatre, comedy directly concerned with the life of particular London localities, is likewise found to rest upon the dramatic practice of the Jacobean and Caroline theatres, not upon a novel desire to portray Restoration life.

The theses that contemporary life is mirrored on the Restoration stage and that Restoration comedy derives from such a source are examined against this background of dramatic convention. It is shown that comic realism is idealized or heightened, and that it cannot therefore be use as a " document " of the life of the period.

Appendices offer a tabulated selection of the occurrence of type characters between Jonson and Congreve, and an explanation of the excisions and textual garbling in a Restoration quarto of Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*.

[Reprinted from *ELH, A Journal of English Literary History,* Vol. 3, No. 4, December, 1936.]

TOPOGRAPHICAL COMEDY IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

By Richard H. Perkinson

The frequency with which Restoration dramatists utilize a popular locale as the background for comedy of manners and intrigue has emphasized a genre which deserves attention. It is a genre, not because it includes plays labeled with the names of particular parks, or fairs, or gardens, but because it is the comedy of the manners and intrigues of habitués of some definite, popular locality. The purpose of scenes laid at Epsom or in St. James's Park palpably is to display the manners of the people who frequent those places or the intrigues for which the localities were thought characteristic. Topographical comedy in the Restoration not only offers a divergence from the confines of the drawing-room, but ostensibly it brings into literature the life of some actual, specific place.

St. Évremond, in his discourse "De La Comédie Angloise," first calls attention to this peculiar use of locale by English comic dramatists:

> Comme ils renoncent presque tourjours à l'unité d'action, pour représenter une personne principale qui les divertit par des actions différentes, ils quittent souvent aussi cette personne principale, pour faire voir diversement ce qui arrive en des lieux publics à plusieurs personnes. Ben-Johnson en a usé de la forte dans Bartholomew Fair. On vient de faire la même chose dans Epsom-Wells; & dans toutes les deux Comédies, on représente comiquement ce qui se passe de ridicule en ces lieux publics.[1]

St. Évremond's generalization certainly is not based only upon the two comedies he names; nor does he intend to be more than casual in his observations. It is easy to understand how a locality when it signified for contemporary audiences a place

[1] *Oeuvres de Monsieur De Saint-Évremond,* Paris, 1753, 4. 37-8. Translated in *Mixt Essays upon Tragedies, Comedies,* 1685, and in Ferrand Spence's *Miscellanea: or Various Discourses,* 1686. Publication in England of this discourse was not necessary to call attention to what was already part of dramatic technique. St. Évremond, when he remarks *Epsom Wells,* might have had in mind Chappuzeau's *Les Eaux de Pirmont,* 1671. The slight, bourgeois comedies of Dancourt, *La Foire de Bésons, Les Eaux de Bourbon,* and *La Foire de Saint Germain* which Ozell translated, did not come until the last decade of the century.

of intrigue or of ill-repute might be utilized in the conduct of the play—how it might, in other words, become a part of the plot. For the historian of the drama Stephen Jones the genre was so stereotyped that he did not hesitate to describe, and aptly enough, its procedure in William Phillips's *Saint Stephen's Green* (1700), which he probably had not examined. Opportunity for comedy of manners and intrigue is provided by the locale which

> is, with respect to Dublin, nearly the same as the Mall in St. James's Park is with regard to London; that is to say, the theater for the playing off all the various turns of vanity, affectation, and gallantry, and the scene of thousands of assignations and intrigues.[2]

The kind of people who came to Epsom, the reputation of the place upon which much of the plausibility of the action ultimately depends, Shadwell is careful to state in the opening scene of his *Epsom Wells*. Again, a specific locality, like the Alsatia of Shadwell's *The Squire of Alsatia*, does something more than offer the opportunity for treatment of manners or for intrigue: it furnishes the dramatist with characters, with those persons indigenous to the place. The effect of locale, then, may be seen in the treatment of manners, in the plot, and in the *dramatis personae* of a comedy.

Popular locale confers also a particular realism which is not altogether recognizable today. Thus Mr. G. Gregory Smith thinks we are inclined to commend Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair* " only as an antiquarian document of unusual interest; it is too 'local' and allusive, as well as too coarse, for the modern reader and playgoer. . . ." [3] St. James's Park in a comedy is hardly distinguishable today from Tottenham Court; for the seventeenth century this confusion did not exist. Bruce, in Shadwell's *The Virtuoso* (1676), observes:

> The Foolish World is never to be mended. For all this, your Glass-Coach will to *Hide-park* for Air. The Suburb-fools trudge to *Lambs Conduit* or *Totnam*; your sprucer sort of Citizens gallop to *Epsom*; your Mechanick gross Fellows, shewing much conjugal affection, strut before their Wives, each with a Child in his Arms, to *Islington* or *Hogsdon*.[4]

[2] *Biographia Dramatica*, 1812, 3. 239. Note the correction on p. 447.
[3] *Ben Jonson*, London, 1926, p. 117.
[4] *The Virtuoso*, 5. 1.

Hippolita and Prue, in the opening scene of Wycherley's *The Gentleman Dancing Master* (1672), lament their imprisonment, the lady remarking, "Not to take a Ramble to the Park nor Mulberry-garden!" And the maid, as befits her tastes, replies, "Nor to *Tatnam-Court* nor *Islington*!" Similar comments occur in many of the topographical comedies. Locale is not always a convenient, blank back-drop to be used indiscriminately; the Restoration picture-stage must have been able to supply a recognizable semblance of the specific place itself. Occasionally a dramatist, like Nabbes in *Tottenham Court* (1633), realizes locale might be used to secure a unity which holds together the diversified action of the plot. The talent of a Jonson or a Shadwell to infuse a comedy with the atmosphere of a place gives the play unity of another kind. By its nature a topographical play, like *Bartholomew Fair* or *Epsom Wells,* secures a general unity of place. Similarly, a number of comedies, perhaps after the example of *Bartholomew Fair,* preserves, a time unity.[5] St. Évremond's charge of looseness must be interpreted with French practice in mind.

Although the vogue of topographical comedy on the Restoration stage, a popularity which extends into the eighteenth century, is probably explainable by the opportunity afforded for treatment of manners and for use of intrigue, the genre to which these plays, or frequently scenes, belong is not a creation of Restoration dramatists. Its history is evidence for the continuity of English drama in the seventeenth century, or for the growth of Restoration out of Jacobean comedy. The genre owes its inception to Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair,* a comedy by no means forgotten during the Restoration, but a play so unique and so characteristic of the dramatist that another wholly like it one should not expect to find. The fair locale occurs again in Shadwell's *Bury Fair,* but naturally other localities suggested themselves for similiar treatment. Plays utilize a park like Shirley's *Hyde Park* or Wycherley's *Love in a Wood; or St. James's Park.* Particular places or resort come into the drama with Nabbes's *Covent Garden* and *Tottenham*

[5] Nabbes, in the epilogue to his *Covent Garden,* calls attention to the preservation of this unity. Dr. C. E. Andrewes comments on the unities in Brome's *Covent Garden Weeded*; *Richard Brome: A Study of his Life and Works,* Yale Studies in English, 46. 84.

Court; Shadwell's *Epsom Wells* calls forth other plays concerned with the society of watering-places.

Brome, in the prologue to his *The 'Sparagus Garden*, apologizes for the slight use made of the locality to which his title refers:

> The Title, too, may prejudice the Play.
> It sayes the *Sparagus Garden*; if you looke
> To feast on that, the Title spoils the Booke.
> We have yet a taste of it, which he doth lay
> I'th midst o'th journey, like a Bait by the way. . . .

Probably no dramatist was willing to attempt Jonson's technical feat; perhaps no other locality offered the scope for such sustained treatment; few comedies utilize locale quite so extensively as *Bartholomew Fair*. For the topographical genre creates a problem affecting material: a plot is made to grow out of the locale, like that of *Bartholomew Fair*, practically a unique example; or more generally a familiar theme is successfully coupled to the locality by capitalizing on the place's frequently questionable reputation; or a plot is imposed upon the locale, like that of Nabbes's *Covent Garden*, merely for the sake of a topographical comedy. Topographical names of plays in some cases, then, may be advertisement; in others, an attempt to call attention to the technical use made of a locality, like a park as a place of intrigue. Because this use of locale could further the action of the comedy—could get it underway, like the fine first act of *Epsom Wells*, could complicate it, as it does in Shirley's *Hyde Park* or in *The Mall* (attributed to Dryden), or could resolve it, like the last act of *Love in a Wood*; *or, St. James's Park*—it is a real contribution to technique. The rise of the genre at this time suggests the popularity of topography in poetry and in painting.[6] But in the drama it is a particularization of the narrowing scope of realistic comedy which transfers locale from Italy, where, for romantic comedy, the impossible was probable, not merely to London, but with topographical comedy to London's particular localities.

[6] See Hilda Taylor, "Topographical Poetry during the Renaissance," University of Chicago Abstracts of Theses, Humanistic Series, 5 (1926-7). 493-7; Robert A. Aubin, *Topographical Poetry in XVIII-Century England*, New York, 1936; Arthur McComb, *The Baroque Painters of Italy*, Cambridge, Mass., 1934. 105.

The use of these particular places of resort familiar to Londoners does not indicate an attempt, as Mr. G. Gregory Smith suggests,[7] to identify literature with life. The premiss is quite the opposite—namely, that the characters, many of them the repetitious types,[8] and the actions are fictitious and need in realistic comedy such realism as these localities provide in order to secure plausibility. The playwrights were not writing social documents of life at Bartholomew Fair or at the Mulberry Garden, but comedy, as St. Évremond recognizes; and this becomes sufficiently apparent from the technical purpose locale is made to serve. It is strange that topographical comedy has not been more widely used as documentation for the case that literature is life since individual plays possess a certain speciousness which is decidedly persuasive and the admission that the titles make, that the play *is* Bartholomew Fair or Tottenham Court, might seem rather large. But a survey of topographical plays will show that the speciousness is artful and not natural, that the type is literary and not sociological, and that it was merely an effective part of the dramatist's stock-in-trade.

Bartholomew Fair, unlike *Epicoene* or subsequent topographical comedies, is not a comedy of manners. The fair was hardly the place for manners; nor did the Jacobean audience as a whole represent that social consciousness which would find dramatization of manners interesting or amusing. But *Bartholomew Fair* demonstrated what could be made of locale, or what locale could be made to contribute to drama. That succeeding dramatists received a technical lesson, and not Jonson's animating gusto, the difference between *Bartholomew Fair* and almost every later topographical play, as well as the attempts to apply Jonson's technique to other localities, sufficiently reveals. Later dramatists were men of lesser individuality or of smaller capacity for the assimilation of life; they naturally examined the successful Jonsonian pattern or formula.

In *Bartholomew Fair* they found a series of rather improbable happenings occurring at a place familiar to all Londoners.

[7] *Ben Jonson,* p. 117.

[8] For an account of these see the present writer's unpublished doctoral dissertation in the library of The Johns Hopkins University, "Aspects of English Realistic Comedy in the Seventeenth Century," Chapter 3.

To suggest, as Mr. G. Gregory Smith does, that *Bartholomew Fair* "is intended first and foremost as a transcript of real life,"[9] or that Adam Overdo is representative of Jacobean judiciary, Busy of contemporary puritanism, Cokes of the Harrow student body, is to stretch probability beyond the expectations of the seventeenth-century realistic dramatist and to forget that this is comedy. Comedy is not, unfortunately, just a matter of transcribing real life; the transcript must contain a certain amount of untruthfulness or unfairness or art which will heighten the normally drab material. The grotesque activities of his characters Jonson aims also to make dramatically plausible; he reaches credibility, not through the emotions of his audience and by poetic appeal, the method of romantic comedy and of tragedy, but by realism of which in this and in subsequent topographical comedies locale is a principal ingredient. The carnival spirit of the fair itself is quite foreign today; it was not unfamiliar to Jonson's audience, or to Lady Castlemaine when, on April 30, 1667, Pepys found her visiting a puppet show in the fair.[10]

It is unnecessary to point out those characters which the fair itself contributes to the comedy. The procedure Jonson adopts, showing in successive scenes the two groups of improbable puritans and cits moving through the actual fair and continually in conflict with it, makes the fair itself the cause of comic misadventure and integrates locale into the plot. The fair ceases to be merely terrain and becomes itself the protagonist.[11] It is reasonably certain that Jonson was aware of the brief Harleston fair scene (1. 3) in Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay,* and of the scenes before the shops of the Royal Exchange in Heywood's *The Fair Maid of the Exchange.*

[9] *Ben Jonson,* p. 117.

[10] Shirley's poem, "A Fairing," probably refers to Bartholomew Fair; *Dramatic Works and Poems,* ed. W. Gifford and A. Dyce, London, 1833, 6. 412-13. The lost *Westminster Fair* (1647) and the two-part royalist satire *New Market Fair* (1649), which I have not seen, may derive from the Jonsonian impetus; the subtitle of part 1 of the latter is *A Parliamentary Outcry of State Comodities set to Sale* and it might be a reply to a pamphlet, *Lambeth Faire wherein you have all the Bishops Trinkets set to Sale,* 1641. In the next century musical pieces by Charles Coffey, *Southwark Fair* (1729), and by Archibald McLaren, *The Humours of Greenock Fair* (*c.* 1788), use the fair situation.

[11] See *Ben Jonson,* ed. C. H. Herford and P. Simpson, 2. 137.

The realism of Heywood's comedy must have been considerably enhanced by the extensive use of the Royal Exchange which contributes the characters of the Cripple and Phillis to the comedy.[12] The first scene of the third act, in which customers come to the shops, is obviously an attempt to put upon the stage a sight familiar to the audience. The play, however, does not emphasize locale, like *Bartholomew Fair,* or manners, like subsequent topographical comedies.

But it is commonly thought that Jonson's own love of the bustle and the gusto of London life, which he saw in striking synthesis at Bartholomew Fair, accounts for the writing of his rather unique comedy. Certainly there is a close connection between Jonson's temperament and his play. Although Jonson might have received hints from earlier topographical scenes, it would appear that in general topographical comedy is an offshoot of renaissance topical writing to be seen in the pamphlets of Greene, Peele, Lodge, and Munday, and in topical plays like Jonson's own *Cynthia's Revels* and *The Poetaster.*[13] In drama this new attention to localization contrasts with the earlier indifference of *The Comedy of Errors* and with the inveterate use of Italy in romantic comedy. The war of the theaters, to which he contributed *Cynthia's Revels* and *The Poetaster,* acquainted Jonson's hand with topical comedy; and he was enough of the theorist to attempt experiment and innovation in *Bartholomew Fair,* and enough of the classicist to direct the attempt toward more general rather than personal satire.

Jonson, in *Bartholomew Fair,* writes a topical comedy that is not personal, but topographical, that does not treat historical personalities or events, but historical scene. Topographical comedy might be said to be impersonally or broadly topical when it treats the habitués of some actual place. For Jonson *Bartholomew Fair* in a general way is a continuation of topical comedy, but upon an impersonal basis: topical scene populated with created characters replaces imaginary locale with its semi-

[12] The Royal Exchange, the foundation of Sir Thomas Gresham, is not to be confused with the New Exchange, built under James I, which appears in *The Country Wife* (3. 2) and in *She Would if She Could* (3) ; the latter usage might have suggested the scene in the second act of Otway's *The Atheist.*

[13] Compare W. Creizenach, *English Drama in the Age of Shakespeare,* p. 59; F. S. Boas, *University Drama in the Tudor Age,* Chapter 13.

topical personalities. In *Cynthia's Revels* and *The Poetaster* with an imaginary locale Jonson makes classical or literary characters act in ways that would suggest Marston or Dekker; by an inversion, in *Bartholomew Fair* he frankly accepts the topical basis of the fair and makes imaginary characters act in comic and improbable ways: they escape being "conditioned" by actual life. When in his comedies Jonson transcribes something like real life, his topical plays, *Cynthia's Revels* and *The Poetaster,* reveal how he does it; his method differs from that of *The Rehearsal* which compounds reality with burlesque, but in procedure and in effect it is the same. In *Bartholomew Fair* the topical, or real life part of the comedy is largely its locale; the ludicruous, fanciful characters are the comic falsifications of life. The "transcript of real life" which the topographical realism of *Bartholomew Fair* and similiar comedies supports is heightened, not by obvious classical masquerade or by downright burlesque, but by an improbability and a comic spirit which is less obtrusive and more beguiling because it takes its cue from the atmosphere of the locale—fair, park, or wells—where the action transpires. Locale, then, performs a double and somewhat contradictory function: the particular place contributes to realism or to credibility; its characteristic atmosphere or reputation by extension and exaggeration, to improbability. The inhabitants of a fair, or the habitués of a park or of a watering-place are impossibly, but with some probability, picturesque, or venturesome, or immoral. The bold experimentation and innovation in realistic technique which Jonson craftily screens with his Induction was not to be disregarded; out of favor on the Caroline stage, the future was with him.

Bartholomew Fair, though produced in 1614, remained unprinted until 1631. The knowledge and reputation of English drama in France at this period scarcely permits the possibility of influence, but La Pinelière's lost *La Foire de Sainct Germain* was written probably at a date that follows close upon the publication of Jonson's comedy. Professor Lancaster suggests that the play, a comedy of manners, was "inspired by the success of Corneille's *Galerie du Palais,*" and thinks that it "gave a picture of manners at the Fair of Saint Germain and thus contributed to the general tendency in the comedy toward

realism,"[14] a service also performed by English topographical plays of the thirties.

The publication of Jonson's play, however, probably did inspire Shirley's *Hyde Park* which was licensed in 1632. Professor Nason finds that "these Hyde Park scenes vaguely suggest the *Bartholomew Fair* of Jonson. . . ."[15] The lesson Shirley takes from Jonson is definitely one in technique. Shirley guides through the park, like Jonson through the fair, three groups of characters, developing the three strands of his plot in a quick succession of scenes; he uses a lodge (4. 3), like Jonson uses the puppet theater, to bring together his various characters. The locality itself contributes runners, a jockey, a dairy maid, and bag pipers. A realistic touch is provided by the introduction of a foot race and a horse race, activities to which the park was given at this time.[16]

Shirley's play is the first of a series of comedies which employ a park locale. His choice of Hyde Park was at the request of Lord Holland to whom, in his dedication, he makes this acknowledgement:

> The comedy, in the title, is a part of your lordship's command, which heretofore graced and made happy by your smile, when it was presented, after a long silence, upon first opening of the Park, is come abroad to kiss your lordship's hand.[17]

The dialogue between Lord Bonvile and Julietta in the opening scene of the fourth act is proof that the reputation of a park was already what it is on the Restoration stage. The park scenes, the entire third and fourth acts, carry on and complicate the action of the comedy in a varied and a sprightly fashion. *Hyde Park* is notable because it is the first play to adapt Jonson's technique not only to a new type of locale, but to comedy in which manners is becoming the outstanding element.

The year 1632 saw the production of two plays using the same locale, Nabbes's *Covent Garden* and Brome's *Covent*

[14] H. C. Lancaster, *A History of French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century*, Part 1, vol. 2. 621-22; 690 ff.

[15] Arthur H. Nason, *James Shirley, Dramatist*, New York, 1915, p. 229.

[16] 3. 1; 4. 3. See H. B. Wheatley and P. Cunningham, *London, Past and Present*, London, 1891, 2. 250.

[17] *Dramatic Works and Poems*, 2. 459.

Garden Weeded, or *The Weeding of Covent Garden.* The piazza of Covent Garden was laid out in 1631 by Inigo Jones,[18] and Nabbes, whose play seems to antedate Brome's, follows Shirley's example and celebrates or advertises the new locality with a comedy. The play gives evidence of having been put together in some haste. It begins on a low comedy note with the arrival at Covent Garden of a country gentleman, Dungworth, and his two servants who are looking for lodgings which a Mrs. Tongall offers to provide. But the drama thereafter becomes a comedy of the manners and intrigues of Sir Generous Worthy's household which occupies one of the new buildings with a balcony on the square.[19] In his prologue and epilogue Nabbes makes a claim to originality which might indicate not only that his comedy precedes Brome's, but that he was conscious of the possibilities the topographical genre held for realistic comedy. His novelty is not in characters or in plot, but in his use of a new type of locale.

It is not impossible that Nabbes's *Covent Garden* was taken as complimentary to the architect of the square, Jonson's old enemy, Inigo Jones. At this very time Jonson must have been employed on his *Tale of a Tub* which caused Jones some embarrassment when it was brought out in 1633.[20] Although Dr. Andrewes denies there are topical references in Brome,[21] it is difficult to see how some of the ridicule in *Covent Garden Weeded* was not meant for the then almost traditional enemy of Brome's old master. Justice Cockbrain, who claims Adam Overdo as an ancestor,[22] but who is also a counterpart of the justice in Nabbes's play, remarks to Rooksbill:

> I Marry Sir! This is something like! These appear like Buildings! Here's Architecture exprest indeed! It is a most sightly scituation, and fit for Gentry and Nobility.[23]

[18] *London, Past and Present,* 1. 461. See also J. A. Gotch, *Inigo Jones,* p. 177.

[19] See 1. 5-6. Note the similar balcony scenes in *Covent Garden Weeded,* 1. 1, and in Otway's *The Soldier's Fortune,* 4. 2. The locale of *Sir Martin Mar-all* is given as Covent Garden. Note the Covent Garden scenes in *The Country Wife,* 5. 3, and *Sir Courtly Nice,* 3. 1.

[20] See Herford and Simpson, *Ben Jonson,* 1. 275 ff.

[21] C. E. Andrewes, *Richard Brome,* p. 92.

[22] 1. 1. Compare the tavern scenes in *Covent Garden,* 4. 1-6, and *Covent Garden Weeded,* 3. 1.

[23] 1. 1. Note the direct reference later to the "Surveyor."

Rooksbill, "a great Builder in *Covent Garden*," as the *dramatis personae* describes him, reminds the audience that the square is unfinished and even still largely unrented.[24] Justice Cockbrain's task is to weed the Garden of the Philoblathici, a company of roaring boys, who so exclusively occupy his attention that he sees no offence to the neighborhood, "fit for Gentry and Nobility," in Crossewill and his family, like Dungworth in Nabbes's play just come up from the country, or in the disreputable establishment maintained by one, Margarie Howlet. The actual topographical background of both Covent Garden plays, though its novelty is significant, is not itself remarkable. For the first, it may have been largely advertisement; for the second, satire.

Stimulated ultimately by *Bartholomew Fair*, these three comedies were directly inspired by localities themselves, by Hyde Park and by Covent Garden. Four comedies follow which use, each of them, similar places of popular resort in the environs of London: Nabbes's *Tottenham Court*, 1633; Brome's *The 'Sparagus Garden*, 1635; Jordan's *The Walks of Islington and Hogsdon*, 1641; and Sedley's *The Mulberry Garden*, 1668. While there is an obvious relationship in the types of localities employed by this group, and one comedy probably suggested the other, the use of these taverns and resorts points to the drama's growing social consciousness. Intrigue, wit, and manners, rather than story, are becoming the dominant interests in comedy, and the topographical genre furnishes a ready vehicle for this development. The country *versus* city theme, so popular with Shadwell, appears in the plays of Brome and of Nabbes; the London citizen begins to attempt a rôle in rivalry with that of the country boor.

Tottenham Court is one of the best of topographical comedies. The pilgrimages to Tottenham, to which Shadwell alludes in *The Virtuoso*,[25] are used by Nabbes as an introduction to the locality where, as St. Évremond observes of the genre, comedy is provided by showing what happens to the various characters brought together. A citizen and his wife, two students, two gallants, and two girls, in the opening scenes are converging upon the tavern, perhaps the Adam and Eve,[26]

[24] 1. 1.

[25] Quoted *ante*.

[26] See *London, Past and Present*, 3. 389.

where the girls, Cicely and Bellamie, take advantage of the reputation of the place and of their disguises to thwart the gallants, Franke and George, and to mystify the students who are their respective brothers. The comedy has unity, variety, in places a suburban freshness, and interest that is well sustained.

Brome's apology for his slight use of the locality to which the title of his *The 'Sparagus Garden* refers has been quoted. Only the third act transpires at the garden, across the Thames from Whitehall, when three blades, Gilbert Gold-wyre, Walter Chamlet, and Sam Touchstone, are drawn there by Walter Chamlet's uncle, Sir Amorous Cautious, a frequenter of the place, upon whom they intend to perpetrate a deception; and when the longings of Rebecca, like those of Win in *Bartholomew Fair*, provide a means for the visit of the cits. With the cits Mony-laçks, " the fly of the new Inne," [27] brings Hoyden, the booby and would-be gallant. The gallant, the cit, the bumpkin, the gullible elderly knight, make up a gallery of type characters whose conjunction Restoration manners comedy usually finds diverting. The act opens with an attempt, in the dialogue between the gardener and his wife, to create the atmosphere of the locality. From the remarks about the prices, one might suspect that the act was put in as a protest; [28] but the use of the garden, as well as the apology of the prologue, is probably attributable to Nabbes's *Tottenham Court*. Again, like Hyde Park and Covent Garden, the inn is a new place of resort.

Thomas Jordan's *The Walks of Islington and Hogsdon, With the Humours of the Wood-street Compter* seems to have been an attempt to outdo Nabbes and Brome; the title neglects to mention the Harrow Tavern in Little Wood-street which is also used.[29] According to the complimentary poem by R. C., the play had a run of nineteen days. For the situation of Mrs. Rivers, who pretends wantonness to effect the cure of her

[27] 1. 3.

[28] See especially the protests recorded in 3. 2 and in 3. 9. Note also the remarks on the reputation of the place, 2. 2; 3. 1.

[29] 3. 3. Other taverns are mentioned: John of Jerusalemn, 3. 2; the Bear upon Fleetbridge, 4. 1; the Feathers tavern in Woodstreet assists Sir Reverence's escape from the Counter in 4. 3.

jealous husband, Jordan might have taken some hints from Lady Worthy in *Covent Garden*, or from Bellamie in *Tottenham Court*. Jordan's play opens at the Saracen's Head in Islington, then moves to the King's Head at Hoxton where the act concludes with an elaborate dance.[30] Islington and Hoxton were resorts of the type of Tottenham Court and were probably even more popular. Jordan's prologue gives a spirited description of his locale and its patronage:

> *A Play of Walks*, or you may please to rank it,
> With that which Ladies love, *A running Banquet*:
> And, though the scoene be *Islington*, we swear,
> We will not blow ye up with Bottle Bear;
> Cram ye with Cream and Fools, which sweetly please
> Ladies of Fortune and young Prentices,
> Who (when the Supervisors come to find 'um)
> Quake like the Custard which they leave behind 'um.[31]

Rivers, who provides the motivation for the movement from tavern to tavern, finally runs his tormenters into the Counter the descriptions of which are as colorful as the tavern scenes are lively. The plot itself is not so unusual as the amount of topography it utilizes; obviously Jordan's intention was to make capital of well known places. This, as well as the success of his comedy, attests the popularity of the procedure he adopts.

Brome's *The 'Sparagus Garden* and its locale survived the interregnum the effect of which on literature and life has been overestimated. Brome's play, Downes records,[32] was revived between 1662 and 1665. Very probably it suggested the use of a similar resort, the Mulberry Garden, which appears incidentally in Cavendish's *The Humorous Lovers* (March 1667), in Etherege's *She Would if She Could* (1667/8), and in Wycherley's *Love in a Wood* (1672), and gives its name to Sedley's comedy which was produced in May 1668. Sedley's use of the locale involves an adroit piece of technique that Wycherley imitates in *Love in a Wood; or St. James's Park*. The first Mulberry Garden scene (1. 3), in which Victoria and Olivia are enumerating men whom they are interested in when they are interrupted

[30] Compare the similar spectacles in *Tottenham Court*, 3. 1; and in *The 'Sparagus Garden*, 3. 3.

[31] Note Subtle's project in *The Alchemist*, 5. 5. 76-80. Pepys was not a stranger at Islington; note especially April 1, 1662 and March 27, 1664.

[32] *Roscius Anglicanus*, ed. M. Summers, p. 26.

by two of them, Estridge and Modish, is a preparation for the important function the locale serves in the fourth act. Wildish conceals the same ladies in an arbor, lures Estridge and Modish into another nearby where he draws from them exaggerated declarations of their power over Olivia and Victoria which the ladies overhear. Locale is made to assist the plot; it affords a natural setting and a means for Wildish's scheme. The reputation of the garden as a place of fashionable resort and intrigue makes the use of the arbors sufficiently plausible.

Pepys saw *The Mulberry Garden* on May 18, May 20, and June 29, 1668; the second performance he witnessed encouraged him on the same day to walk.

> over the Park to the Mulberry-Garden, where I never was before; and find it a very silly place, worse than Spring-garden, and but little company, and those a rascally, whoring, roguing sort of people, only a wilderness there, that is somewhat pretty, but rude.

The life which Pepys finds at the actual Mulberry Garden contrasts strongly with the technical use of the locality in the play.

In July 1668, Shirley's *Hyde Park* was revived with an attempt at some spectacular staging; Pepys, on July 11, records the use of horses for the race scene; three days later, the play had a royal performance.[33] Three years later Wycherley's *Love in a Wood; or, St. James's Park* was produced. Other Restoration comedies, *The Mall* (1674) and *Greenwich Park* (1691), use the same and a similar locality. Although young Bellair in the Mall scene (3. 3) in *The Man of Mode* (1668) prefers Hyde Park, Charles's improvements, among them the Mall, at St. James's won the celebration of Waller's poem, " On St. James's Park, as lately improved by His Majesty," and a measure of popular approval. Wycherley's characters discuss the place:

> *Ranger.* Hang me if I am not pleas'd extremely with this new fashion'd caterwouling, this mid-night coursing in the Park.
>
> *Vincent.* A Man may come after Supper with his three Bottles in his head, reel himself sober, without reproof from his Mother, Aunt, or grave relation.
>
> . . . . . .

[33] Allardyce Nicoll, *A History of Restoration Drama*, Cambridge, 1928, p. 306. Note Tom Brown's comments on contemporary Hyde Park, *Amusements*, ed. A. L. Hayward, London, 1927, 6, " The Walks."

Dapperwit. And a Man of wit may have the better of the dumb shew, of well trim'd vest, or fair Peruque; no man's now is whitest.

(2. 1)

More pertinent are the comments of Lydia and of Lady Flippant; the former cheerfully assures the ambitious widow, "there does not pass a night here, but many a match is made." So taking this cue, the widow remarks to a muffled figure, Sir Simon Addleplot, "this is the time and place for freedom, Sir." Later she finds occasion to reprove Lydia, "Then you are a very Park-Woman certainly, and you will take it kindly if I leave you." This reputation of the park gives Dryden the chance to modernize Juvenal's sixth satire (87-8):

> Whither wou'dst thou to chuse a Wife resort,
> The Park, the Mall, the Play-house, or the Court?

This scene in Wycherley's comedy, however, like Sedley's first scene at the Mulberry Garden, is obviously preparatory for the use of the park in the first scene of the last act when, in the darkness, the various complicated threads of the plot are brought together and disentangled. The situation enables the dramatist to get his characters on and off the stage readily and in quick succession. The scene is a good example of the technical end which a specific locale could be made to serve. It really concludes the play. Although Wycherley's technique is inspired by the Jonson-Shirley use of a locality to carry on simultaneously several plots, in *Love in a Wood* the method is concentrated into one scene and is more striking because it is applied to the solution rather than to the development of the comedy.

In December 1672, Shadwell's *Epsom Wells* was produced, the first English topographical play to utilize a fashionable spa for comedy of manners. Dr. Borgman remarks:

> Despite the fact that *Epsom-Wells*, in some instances, resembles earlier plays, it would be quite incorrect to think of the comedy as anything but an original piece of work. To the watering-place of Epsom, situated fourteen miles from the metropolis, Shadwell transplants a group of Londoners from the drawing-rooms, Mulberry Garden, and Hyde Park.[34]

[34] A. S. Borgman, *Thomas Shadwell: his Life and Comedies*, New York, 1928, p. 155. Shadwell's originality, like Nabbes's in *Covent Garden*, is distinctly in his

Since Shadwell's topographical originality in this play is worthy of comment, it should be pointed out that his comedy of watering-place society might have been suggested by Samuel Chappuzeau's *Les Eaux de Pirmont* just as his *The Sullen Lovers* was inspired by Moliere's *Les Fâcheux*, as he acknowledges in his preface, which he knew at the time only by report. Chappuzeau's second London visit, in 1667, certainly introduced him to the attention, if not to the acquaintance, of the incipient English playwright.[35] Shadwell was sufficiently alive to contemporary French drama to make his interest in the comedy which Chappuzeau wrote and produced at Bad Pyrmont in 1669 very plausible. The play was available in print in 1671, a year before Shadwell produced *Epsom Wells*, in Chappuzeau's collection, *La Muse enjouée*.

Les Eaux de Pirmont and *Epsom Wells* are similar not only in their use of watering-place society, but in scenes laid at the respective wells of Pyrmont and Epsom. In Chappuzeau's play, the wells scene provides a locale at which the comedy is brought to its spirited conclusion; but Shadwell's similar scene is one of the best opening acts he was to write: it introduces practically every character, establishes the atmosphere of the comedy, and gets his plot underway.[36]

Dr. Borgman, with *Bartholomew Fair* in mind, writes that "Shadwell makes Epsom merely the scene of his action, and introduces no characters primarily of the Wells," that is, no characters like Ursula, Nightingale, and Leatherhead.[37] But

locale. Other comedies follow: *Tunbridge Wells*, by Rawlins, 1677/8; *Wexford Wells*, by Concannen, 1721; *Richmond Wells*, by John Williams, 1722; and the elder Colman's *The Spleen; or, Islington Spa*, 1776.

[35] See Frederich Meinel, *Samuel Chappuzeau*, Borna-Leipzig, 1908; on *Les Eaux de Pirmont*, pp. 19-20; 50. Professor Lancaster first called my attention to this comedy.

[36] Chappuzeau's direction reads: "GERONTE, ORPHISE, AMINTE, LISETE, *avec une troupe de gens qui boiuent à la fontaine sous le noms de* LYSANDRE, ALCIPE, ORANTE, LVCRECE, ALISON." Shadwell's Direction: "*Enter Mrs.* Woodly, Bisket, *Mrs.* Bisket, Fribble *and his Wife*, Kick, Puff, Dorothy *and* Margaret; to Toby *and others, drinking at the Wells.*" Similar scenes are in *Tunbridge Wells* (3. 1) and at Deptford Wells in Greenwich-*Park* (4. 2).

[37] *Thomas Shadwell*, p. 156. Mr. Montague Summers, in *The Complete Works of Thomas Shadwell*, 2. 97, denies the relationship with *Bartholomew Fair* which Dibdin states badly; see *A Complete History of the Stage*, 1800, 4. 182-3. Mr. Borgman, attempting to find a common ground, quotes St. Évremond (quoted *ante*), but seems to overlook the fact that St. Évremond is discussing the lack of

surely this is expecting too much of Epsom as well as overlooking the interests of Restoration dramatists in the social mode, in manners and in intrigues. Shadwell does present the habitués and frequenters of a popular watering-place and writes a comedy about their manners and their supposed intrigues. The characters, their social positions, their excuses for taking the waters, the small talk of the spring room, the reputation of Epsom, must have been familiar to the Restoration audience, which, if Pepys is typical of it, probably visited the spa at least once.[38] Furthermore, in the provincial locales of Epsom and St. Edmundsbury Shadwell finds a ground upon which he can display the conflict between country and city as well as he does in Alsatia.

The unknown author of *The Mall; or, the Modish Lovers* (1674) utilizes only the worst reputation of St. James's Park to complicate and to secure probability for his major plot, which is like that of *All's Well that Ends Well* and *Love's Last Shift*, but given a humorous turn by application of the mistaken identity theme. Mrs. Woodbee, a pseudo widow, is the counterpart of Helena and Mrs. Loveless; attempting to keep Mrs. Easy's appointment with Lovechange, her husband, she falls into the plot of Courtwell who had planned to keep Lovechange's rendezvous. Specific places in the park, the "*Mall*, at the upper end," and "*the side of the Duck pond, under those Trees, on the bank*," are mentioned.[39] If slightly audacious in its immorality, *The Mall* is sufficiently grim in its humour.

Though *Tunbridge Wells; or, A Day's Courtship* (1676/7), attributed to Thomas Rawlins, patently owes its inspiration to *Epsom Wells*, there is nothing specific in this similar comedy of manners and intrigues which might justify calling it an imita-

unity in English comedy. The relationship which St. Évremond and perhaps Dibdin had in mind is rather one of a comic type or genre.

[38] For an account of Pepys' visit, see his diary under July 25-6, 1663. The society he found there was as diversified as that of Shadwell's play.

[39] The Mall was one of Charles's improvements; see *London, Past and Present*, 3. 8. Note also the Mall scene, 3. 3, in *The Man of Mode* (1675/6) which follows the Wycherley technique; and the opening scenes of Otway's *Friendship in Fashion* (1678) and *The Soldier's Fortune* (1679/80). Scenes in St. James's Park occur in Congreve's *The Old Bachelor* (1692/3), 4. 4, 5, and in *The Way of the World* (1699-1700), 2. 1. The *Biographia Dramatica* records an anonymous *St. James's Park*, published in 1733.

tion.[40] The scenes at the wells, though similar in setting to Chappuzeau's and Shadwell's, do not come until the third act (3.1,4), and, like the park scenes in *Hyde Park,* serve merely to further the action. Shadwell's splendid first act probably warned the author away from a similar beginning, and he conveys the atmosphere of the watering-place society early in the play through his characters and their comments. The opening dressing-room scene, like those in *Epicoene, The Man of Mode,* and *Bury Fair,* shows Fairlove inquiring of his valet, " What Company came down last night? " And Owman entering and asking Fairlove, " What Hurricane of Love drove thee from *London,* before our Beauties do desert the *Mall,* the dusty Park, and treating Mulberry? "

In the handling of the first scene at the wells (3.1), Wycherley's technique is imitated rather than Jonson's or Shirley's: that is, various groups are successively brought forward at the same place instead of shifting the scene itself to various parts of the same locality. In the second wells scene (3.4), there are dances like those in *Tottenham Court, The 'Sparagus Garden,* and *The Walks of Islington and Hogsdon.* Like Epsom and other places, the locale enables the dramatist to present a diverse society, a knight, an alderman and his wife, a licentious pseudo widow, a tradesman, a poet, a midwife, a sharper, and a doctor, and to treat manners and intrigues more characteristic of a locality than of the drawing room. Confirmation for the definite, watering-place society of these wells plays is provided by Rochester's poem, " Tunbridge Wells," dated June 30, 1675, approximately the time of Rawlins's comedy.[41] The poet goes early to the waters,

> The Rendezvouze of Fools, Buffons and Praters,
> Cuckolds, Whores, Citizens, their Wives and Daughters.

He takes up and satirizes the characters enumerated and others. His comments on the supposed efficacy of the waters resemble those of Shadwell and Rawlins. A characteristic cynical reflection concludes this piece of social satire.

[40] *Biographia Dramatica,* 3. 358; Langbaine, *English Dramatic Poets,* 1691, p. 554. The locale appears again in Thomas Baker's *Tunbridge Walks* (1702/3).

[41] *Collected Works of John Wilmot Earl of Rochester,* ed. J. Hayward, London, 1926, pp. 122-26.

Whether Shadwell, when he wrote *The Squire of Alsatia* (1688), was acquainted with Barrey's *Ram Alley* (*c.* 1607-8), a comedy laid in that byway, once referred to by Belfond Junior (3. 1), of the protected district, nothing but a general resemblance suggests. Barrey's comedy, which, like *The Fair Maid of the Exchange*, makes little of its topography, is similar in its bald realism, in its use of the cast mistress marriage, and in characters like Small-shanks, the wastrel-rake, Throat, guller of young heirs, and the blustering Captain Face.[42]

The theme implied by the title of Shadwell's *The Squire of Alsatia*, the theme of country *versus* city, had received treatment from the dramatist before, but at localities amenable to the *beau monde* rather than at a place distinctive of London's lower life. It is from this choice of London topography that the play secures its color, its resemblance to *Bartholomew Fair*, and characters peculiar to the locale, Shamwell, Captain Hackum, Cheatley, and the rest. Just as the conflict in *Bartholomew Fair* is between the fair and groups of puritans and cits who incongruously come into its bounds, so in *The Squire of Alsatia* it is Alsatia against the country booby, Belfond Senior, against the country gentleman, his father, and finally, in Shadwell's sociological outburst in the last act, against society itself. The district is the cause of Belfond Senior's misadventures which cause the complications between Belfond Junior and his father and uncle: Alsatia provides the test for the rival theories of education exemplified by the two brothers. The improbabilities of the stiff, Terrentian plot are animated and made probable to seventeenth-century Londoners who were as well acquainted with the Whitefriars district as they were with the Mulberry Garden. Shadwell selects this familiar, realistic London locale because in his plot there are things " That befall prepost'rously."

In *Bury Fair* (1689) Shadwell again depends upon the city *versus* country theme to justify the extensive use of characters not altogether typical of the *beau monde* of Restoration comedy. Shadwell felt he could do this because he realized that it was comedy primarily that the audience wanted and comedy not necessarily suggestive of a transcript of the *beau monde*

[42] Compare also the colorful Counter scenes in *The Walks of Islington and Hogsdon* and the huffs in Tatham's *The Scotch Figgaries* (1652).

life. The fair at St. Edmundsbury, therefore, like the waters at Epsom, provides the excuse for the comic conjunction of various characters. " 'Tis the public time of the Fair, when men of all countries flock hither," Charles tells Bellamy (1.2). The foreign contribution in the play is the pseudo French count, the barber La Roch, who takes in the provincial society which *in toto* represents the would-be. The fair itself, perfunctory and colorless, serves otherwise only a technical purpose in the play. In the first fair scene (2.2), all the chief characters are brought together on the stage.

Mountfort, in *Greenwich Park* (1691), conforms to the now established procedure for a park comedy. He follows Shirley in using Greenwich Park to carry on the threads of his plot; the night scenes in the third act might have been suggested by those in *Love in a Wood.* D'Urfey places the locale of his *The Intrigues at Versailles* (1696/7) abroad and at Versailles because he felt that distance and the reputation of the locale might enhance the plausibility of his complicated intrigues which, in their extravagance, go beyond those of English realistic comedy.

Mr. John Palmer, in his extensive treatment of Restoration comedy of manners, tells us:

> Restoration comedy owed almost as little to France as to the English school it displaced. It was an independent growth springing spontaneously from the impulse of English Restoration Society to view itself in reflection upon the stage.[43]

Historically the Restoration type or genre of comedy which St. Évremond remarks originates on the pre-Commonwealth stage. For reasons suggested here, it becomes part of the realistic dramatist's stock-in-trade which the Restoration playwright shows no intention to reject. If the Restoration dramatist set about to put contemporary life upon the stage, as Mr. Palmer and others hold, one would certainly expect that the comedy or scenes laid at particular, well-known localities would offer an actual transcript of life. But as we have seen, the tendency is to use topography for technical ends, to secure plausibility, to carry on or to solve a plot, or to demonstrate a theme. This is in accord with the general interest of a sophisti-

[43] *The Comedy of Manners*, p. 66.

cated, social-urban period in the manner rather than in the objective. The Restoration picture-stage doubtless contributed to the technical effectiveness of topographical scenes. The segregation of this genre has an interest, then, which is not merely historical; it suggests an approach which leads to the technical side of realistic drama and away from the real life which the comedy of realism is often supposed to transcribe. In topographical comedy we should expect to find a revelation of actual life at Bartholomew Fair, at the Mulberry Garden, or at Epsom; but plays reveal in their use of topography, not a sociological interest, but one rather in effective theater, in such problems as probability and plotting. If, according to Bishop Hurd, one should by all means determine what the writer is trying to do, it should be fairly obvious that a Restoration dramatist had no reason to bore his audience with a transcript of real life at the Mulberry Garden as Pepys describes it; on the other hand, the comic playwright must have felt some obligation to amuse. Realistic comedy, it seems, must have the element of probability. And the Restoration, bringing to the stage comedy in which intrigue, generally of a questionable nature, is a notable feature, finds that the environment of places and resorts fits well into its technique. The attempts of recent critics to create a problem by assuming that seventeenth-century realistic dramatists wrote according to the Platonic theory of art, springs not from seventeenth-century comedy, but from the romantic state of mind which refuses to accept fiction as fiction and which entertains the wish that, when it is morally bad rather than good, it be somehow real life—a naiveté which the Restoration would have found sufficiently amusing.

Fordham University

[Reprinted from *ELH, A Journal of English Literary History*, Vol. I, No. 3, December, 1934.]

A RESTORATION "IMPROVEMENT" OF *DOCTOR FAUSTUS*

By Richard H. Perkinson

In 1663 a quarto edition of Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* was published, of which but three copies survive.[1] Mr. Boas, the latest editor,[2] and Mr. Tucker Brooke [3] agree in dismissing the peculiar text, because of its expurgations, as probably of Commonwealth origin. The evidence passed over, however, seems really the more striking and curious feature of the version. Stated broadly, this comprises the excision of the first and second scenes of the third act, which have to do with the visit of Faustus and Mephistophilis to Rome; and the substitution of matter slightly similar and partially borrowed from the original scenes and *The Jew of Malta*, but localized at the palace of the Turkish Emperor in Babylon. Into this setting five new characters are introduced.[4] The other addition to the play is merely a short comic development of material already present. An investigation of this excision calls for the consideration of some aspects which at first may seem irrelevant. Its implications touch upon the still uncertain question of the early Restoration companies, the status of the stage and the contemporary political-religious situation. Likewise, an examination of the printed text of the new scenes demands a scrutiny of the material, the method of transmission, and other bibliographical points.

Textually, of course, the value of this late quarto is insignificant.[5] But there is reason to believe that it should not be

[1] Two copies are in the British Museum, one at South Kensington. See *Doctor Faustus*, ed. Breymann, Heilbronn, 1889, pp. xiii ff. The title page reads: "The Tragicall History | of the Life and Death of | Doctor Faustus. | Printed with New Additions as it is now Acted. With several | New Scenes together with the Actors Names. | Written by Ch. Mar. | [Vignette.] | Printed for *W. Gilbertson* at the Bible without Newgate 1663."

[2] *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus*, ed. F. S. Boas, p. 5. References here will be to this edition.

[3] *The Works of Christopher Marlowe*, ed. C. F. Tucker Brooke, p. 141.

[4] The new material Boas reprints in Appendix 4.

[5] The usual disintegration was accelerated by poor printing, upon which the fact that the play was set up in Roman type for probably the first time may have had some bearing.

dismissed too casually, especially if the history of Elizabethan drama, and of Marlowe particularly, is to be traced out. Dilke, first of modern editors, set the mode for an off-hand treatment:

> The last edition [1663] is intolerably corrupt; the whole scene at Rome is left out, and one at Constantinople [*sic*] substituted, merely giving an account of the means by which the Turks gained possession of Malta, and copied [*sic*] from *The Rich Jew of Malta* by this author; another scene has considerable additions; in brief, it is not worth referring to.[6]

Mr. Boas, the latest editor, comments only briefly and in summary of Mr. Brooke's opinion, to which he refers. Mr. Brooke writes:

> The edition of 1663 varies greatly from all the others, and has no authority. Several weak comic insertions appear, the most notable being in large measure plagarized from the *Jew of Malta*. This edition carries to a ridiculous degree the prudery of the version of 1616-31. Lines and phrases alluding to the deity, to eternal punishment, or to religious scepticism are ruthlessly expunged. It may well be that the text was prepared for acting by strolling players during the Commonwealth period. We know that *Mucedorus* and other plays were so acted in defiance of Puritan regulations, and such an origin would account for the extraordinary efforts of the editor to remove all moral grounds of offence.[7]

Mr. Brooke later brings the extent of the indebtedness to *The Jew of Malta* within its proper bounds.[8] Neither Mr. Brooke nor Mr. Boas saw anything more significant than "comic insertions" in the new third act scenes. Again, Mr. Brooke is making no distinction betwen the expurgation of profanity and religious references,[9] a practice dating from James' statute and the edition of 1616 which may have been applied to the text before, during, or after the Commonwealth, and the removal of an outstanding and popular satirical episode and the substitution of another which, in the case in

[6] *Old English Plays;* 1814, 1. 8. Dilke, when he wrote Constantinople, may have been confused by allusions in 3.3B to a visit to that city; Chapter 22 of the *English Faust Book* relates this. But there is probably nothing to indicate a new use of the source. See also Dyce's *The Works of Christopher Marlowe,* 1865, p. xxii.

[7] *Op. cit.,* p. 141.

[8] "The Reputation of Christopher Marlowe," *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* 25 (1922). 385.

[9] Hardly more striking or ridiculous than in Davenant's *Hamlet* (pr. 1676); see Hazelton Spencer, *Shakespeare Improved,* p. 178.

hand, is not something that may be associated with either the Jacobean era or the Commonwealth. That the play had been subjected to editing, the division into acts for the first time and the listing of the characters indicates. Mr. Brooke's "editor" was presumably part of the Commonwealth company of strolling players; but editing of this nature points rather to the publisher's office. The removal of the original third act—what is retained is unimportant enough—certainly seems far more significant in tracing the origin of the version.

But before disagreeing at greater length with Mr. Brooke's hypothesis, the connection with the Restoration stage should be established. Mr. Brooke suggests that it was this version Pepys saw at the Red Bull in 1662;[10] and Mr. Boas throws off an inquiry as to its possible connection with a later royal performance: "Was it this same version that was acted on 28 September in the Royal presence by the Duke of York's company, who received by consent £10 for the performance?"[11]

The stage history of the play involves a rather curious question as to the company with which, it would seem, the version originated in 1662.[12] The performance of the play in that year and its publication in the next, "with new additions as it is now acted," together with circumstances bearing upon the canceled and the substituted material, seem to place the text as a Restoration "improvement" rather than a surreptitious Commonwealth attempt.

There are three definitely recorded performances of the play in the Restoration. Pepys saw it at the Red Bull on May 26, 1662, where he found it "so wretchedly and poorly done, that we were sick of it, and the worse because by a former resolution it is to be the last play we are to see till Michaelmas." In the list of performances seen by Dr. Edward Browne, probably in the same year, an entry of *Doctor Faustus* occurs in an enumeration of plays by the King's Men playing at the Cockpit, where, apparently, they must have come from Gibbons' Tennis

[10] "Reputation of Christopher Marlowe," p. 385.

[11] *Op. cit.*, p. 50.

[12] The entry in Langbaine's *Lives and Characters* (1699) of *Doctor Faustus*, "4*to.* 1661, being the last Edition, printed with the Addition of many Scenes," is probably erroneous; he enters a 1661 *Lust's Dominion* also. But since only three copies of the 1663 edition survive, one can not be too certain in denying a 1661.

Court.[13] But in the margin, against the entry, is the curious notation, "K. Licens: Players." Mr. Hotson, who takes no notice of the Pepys reference, argues for Jolly's company:

> The epithet "licensed" serves to distinguish this company from Killigrew's (The King's) players, and from Davenant's actors at the Duke's theatre. Besides these two companies, Jolly's were the only "licensed players" in London.[14]

Mr. Nicoll disagrees with the second statement. He notes that Rhodes also claimed royal authorization.[15] He suggests that he maintained probably a traveling troupe after his best players had been secured by Davenant in 1660; and that he used, when in London, the Red Bull and the Cockpit.[16] Rhodes' company, he thinks, existed up to the end of 1602;[17] and new evidence seems to indicate that if it did, it may then have been broken up by the efforts of the two patentees to assert their monopoly.[18] At least Rhodes needed a new license later. The

[13] British Museum, Sloane MS, 1900. The transcript used here was made by Dr. Ernest A. Strathmann. Dr. J. G. McManaway and I expect to print shortly an annotated transcript of the play-lists in this manuscript. Evidence would indicate that Browne made at least three visits to London between 1660 and 1664, during which he saw the plays he has listed.

[14] Leslie Hotson, *The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage*, 1928, pp. 178-9.

[15] Allardice Nicoll, *A History of Restoration Drama*, 1928, p. 273; see also p. 382.

[16] *Ibid.*, pp. 278, 382.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 278.

[18] There is no need here for a restatement of the positions of Mr. Nicoll and Mr. Hotson. It might be objected, against Mr. Hotson's theory for Jolly's company, that Beeston, who successfully appealed to the Lord Chamberlain when Jolly left his theater to go to the Cockpit, probably in November, 1661, would certainly have again complained if, despite the king and Lord Chamberlain, he again had gone there to give the performance of *Doctor Faustus* (see Hotson, pp. 178-9; Nicoll, pp. 277, 382). We have no evidence of his having used the Red Bull. It is not yet certain whether Mr. Nicoll's theory has been affected by the discovery that the cast of *Ignoramus*, a court performance on Nov. 1, 1662, for which Rhodes received payment (Nicoll, p. 278), was made up largely of known Duke's Men. Mr. Hotson (pp. 214-5) and Mr. Bernard M. Wagner ("John Rhodes and *Ignoramus*" in *RES* 5. 43-8) almost simultaneously published the cast for this performance. There are implications which are not yet altogether clear, as the source and final disposition of at least seven of the performers, who, with an actor Tanner, first noted in the company along with several others on Nov. 4, 1662 (Nicoll, p. 283), do not reappear in later lists. Mr. Wagner stresses the fact that the document stated the play had been performed at the Cockpit, a reference, he thinks, to 1660, before Davenant took over the company. That the payment was made to Rhodes as Davenant's deputy, Mr. Hotson states, suggested something more than employment to Mr. Wagner. He thinks that Rhodes retained the playing rights to *Ignoramus*, though it is curious he would do so if he had no use for them, and that his association with Davenant was caused by a desire for a court

reading of Browne's notation is not certain; it is suggested now that it may indicate a royal performance.[19] The whole matter is still too indefinite for comment here; and the evidence does not permit much more than conjecture. The "book" of this version was secured, then, if it was not originally owned, by

performance of the play. The possibility of a partial amalgamation for the performance, or a partial absorption of the Rhodes company, should also be considered. An unidentified member of the *Ignoramus* cast is a Williams; Hotson shows (p. 215) that he could not have been Joseph Williams. Could he have been the Robert Williams of the unidentified Norwich players of 1660-61 (Bernard M. Wagner, "George Jolly at Norwich," *RES* 6. 452)? As Mr. Wagner notes, the language of the license for the provinces Rhodes obtained on Jan. 2, 1663/4 seems to recognize a previous authorization ("John Rhodes and *Ignoramus*," p. 48). A similar license was prepared for Jolly on Jan. 1, 1662/3, two days after his agreement with the patentees (Nicoll, p. 277, Hotson, pp. 179 ff.). If the various circumstances of Davenant's dealings with Rhodes do not point to some continuous relationship, an understanding may have been reached late in 1662 which paralleled, in purpose at least, the agreement with Jolly. G. Beeston and some of his men joined Killigrew upon the break up of their company (Nicoll, p. 279). The two patentees, of course, were asserting their monopoly and were striving to liquidate other companies. If the *Ignoramus* performance indicates that Rhodes came to some agreement with Davenant, the break up of his company may have been the means by which Gilbertson obtained an actor's recollection of the new scenes and the Duke's Men secured the "book" of this version of *Doctor Faustus*. That no company, unless Rhodes', until Chappuzeau's 1665 visit (see W. J. Lawrence, "A Forgotten Restoration Playhouse," *Engl. Stud.* 35, 1905, 279-89) was established at the Cockpit, though Jolly and Killigrew on occasion found it desirable, that the inferior Salisbury Court, or remodeled tennis courts, were utilized instead, may indicate Rhodes kept it under lease, used it himself, or sublet it. Thus Killigrew's presence there in 1662 may explain the Red Bull performance of *Doctor Faustus*, if Rhodes gave it. Lawrence suggests Jolly's company as the occupant of the Cockpit on Chappuzeau's visit; but Mr. Wagner shows ("George Jolly at Norwich") that his was the company Chappuzeau referred to as playing at Norwich. If Rhodes, then, occupied the Cockpit in 1665, the theory that he had some claim upon the house would be borne out. That the theater was vacant on Chappuzeau's 1668 visit may indicate a traveling troupe.

[19] Dr. James G. McManaway's interesting suggestion in the present number of *ELH*, p. 286. Mr. W. W. Greg, printing a transcript of the Browne notebook ("Theatrical Repertories of 1662," *Gentleman's Magazine* 301, July–Dec. 1906, pp. 69-72) reads for "K. Licens," "Quens(?)." If Nicoll and Greg are correct, a Cockpit company, presumably Rhodes', assumed the name of the house's earlier company. Again, if Mr. Nicoll is right and Rhodes gave the Red Bull *Doctor Faustus* (p. 278), and if "Queen's Players" means a performance for the queen (*cf.* Nicoll, p. 325-6), the Cockpit performance may have been later in the year and, like the Rhodes *Ignoramus*, the result of some kind of amalgamation or association. That there were other performances of *Doctor Faustus* in 1662, besides those noted by Pepys and Browne, references in Wilson's *The Cheats*, written in that year, may indicate. Since he is referring in his prologue to the contemporary stage, the mention of the devil may point to Mephistophilis. Scruple (2. 3) refers to Faustus' compact, and Mopus (5. 1) essays a mock-conjuring scene with a lengthy speech in a Latinic jargon. Scruple's use of "read" may indicate the *Faust Book*; but a Puritan could hardly be made to speak of seeing a play.

the Duke's company which was paid for performing it before the king on September 28, 1675.[20]

The possibility of a performance after 1675 is suggested by notations in an apparently contemporary hand in one of the British Museum quartos.[21] The names of Betterton and Mountfort are written against the rôles of Faustus and Mephistophilis in the list of characters. As Mountfort was probably not born until 1664, he must have assumed the rôle sometime after its last recorded performance. Genest prints a curious double entry for 1686 at the Theatre Royal;[22] both Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* and Mountfort's farce adaptation are bracketed together. It would seem plausible that a performance was given sometime between 1675 and the appearance of the farce.[23] Mountfort's rôle in such a production suggests an immediate inspiration for his own comic adaptation.

As indicated before, it is Mr. Boas who suggests the possibility of a connection between the performance in 1675 and the 1663 quarto which links itself up with the other performances seen by Pepys and Browne. The performance of the play in one year and its publication the next, "with new additions as it is now acted," indicates a fairly definite connection between the quarto and the 1662 performances. This must also have been the same version presented in 1675 and, probably, later. The evidence revolves about a situation that Mr. Brooke, who suggests a Commonwealth origin on the basis of the expurgation of profanity, apparently passed over. He views the scene at Babylon, replacing the Roman adventure of Faustus and Mephistophilis, as a comic insertion; its action follows the original material and no new comic contribution is made. Mr. Brooke's hypothesis, that the 1663 version was one "prepared for strolling players during the Commonwealth," is somewhat weakened by the apparent reference on the title page of the 1662 performances. The matter becomes much more definite when the canceled material is considered in the light of the contemporary political situation. The scenes

[20] Nicoll, p. 310.

[21] Cf. Boas, p. 50, n. 2. I am indebted to Dr. J. G. McManaway for examining these quartos for me.

[22] *Some Account of the English Stage*, Bath, 1832, 10. xxxiii of the index.

[23] The theatrical possibilities would have recommended the play to the Dorset Garden stage.

excised will be found to contain the very telling and certainly at the same time satiric and comic situation in which Mephistophilis and Faustus make the Pope and the Papal court more ridiculous than does any serious propaganda of the Commonwealth. And obviously this would be the very scene that might go somewhat toward exculpating a performance during the Commonwealth, when the Pope was identified as anti-Christ and Papists as idolaters. Dr. Spencer remarks upon the "political implications" of Davenant's two 1658 "operas": [24] "On them the government seems to have looked with indulgence or even favor because they were anti-Spanish and anti-Catholic." What could have better excused *Doctor Faustus* than the anti-Romish propaganda with which Puritanism associated itself? If it was a comic situation the Commonwealth "editor" wanted, he could not have done better than to retain the original scenes. The significance of the anti-Catholic character of the play might be considered somewhat further.

It seems plausible that the anti-Papal element, which exists in the source, had no small effect upon the changing character of the drama as it underwent its various revisions. Mr. Simpson [25] conjectures that Marlowe's original *Doctor Faustus* accentuated "Faustus' travels in quest of knowledge," with "something of the processional effect of *Tamburlaine*" and with the tragic note of his "spiritual struggle." If the disintegration of the text at the hands of successive revisers was prompted by success in the theater, popular taste, such a scene as the buffoonery with the Pope and his court would be among the strongest of the destructive factors.[26] Mr. Simpson would identify only the Chorus to this third act, of the 1604 text, as probably Marlowe's work. This presumption that the Roman scene is largely an accretion is seemingly borne out by the fact that in the 1616 quarto it is increased by about 200 lines, acquiring over a third of the new material. It is hardly an exaggeration, then, to say that to the Elizabethan and

[24] Hazelton Spencer, *Shakespeare Improved*, p. 7. The "operas," *The Cruelty of the Spaniards in Peru* and *The History of Sir Francis Drake*, were, moreover, given publicly at the Cockpit.

[25] Percy Simpson, "The 1604 Text of Marlowe's '*Doctor Faustus*,'" *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association* 7 (1921). 147.

[26] *Ibid.*, pp. 153-4.

Jacobean audiences, and to those of the Commonwealth — if they saw it — this scene was decidedly one of the most telling and popular. And there is no definite modification in the contemporary attitude toward the Papacy until the Restoration. Mr. Robertson's remarks on this circumstance, that the anti-Papalism has thrown the play out of balance and was the result of popular demand, are worth noting:

> But, the bargain made, the fruition eludes us. The third Act, with its genuine Chorus, starts Faustus to Rome; and the first scene is pleasantly expatiative; but the game of flouting the Pope is outlined even before we come to the second section, which is at once reminiscent of the tone of old KING JOHN, playing Protestantism against Papalism. If Marlowe wrote the bulk of the first and second scenes of Act III, the failure is already substantial.
>
> To succeed on the stage, apparently, the play has to go in some such fashion. Popular diablerie and gramarye, legerdemain, flouting of Popes and friars and cardinals and potentates, form the bulk of the middle action; and the upshot is that, barring the brief possession of Helen in a splendid flight of poetry, Faustus is duly and terrifically damned for a life of soul-purchased gratification which ran mainly to making a fool of the Pope and the Papacy.[27]

To have excised this scene in 1616 would have been an almost fatal and certainly deplorable Bowdlerizing. But, as noted before, it was enlarged. The play's significant political-religious implications were certainly not overlooked in 1660. Why, then, were the scenes replaced, not during the Commonwealth which was not distinguished for a tolerant attitude toward Rome, but presumably at the opening of the Restoration, in the performances seen by Pepys and Browne, in the quarto printed the following year, and in the version acted before the king thirteen years later?

Whatever company performed the play at the Cockpit and the Red Bull was presumably a licensed company. Killigrew and Davenant had been granted a monopoly by the king in 1660; and late in the same year a royal writ gave Jolly the right to organize a company. And, as noted before, Rhodes could also claim a royal authorization. The theater was entirely in the debt of the Restoration and of the court;[28] the

[27] J. M. Robertson, *Marlowe*, p. 73. Oxberry felt the effect of these circumstances without recognizing the textual conclusion; *cf.* the biographical sketch prefixed to *The Jew of Malta*, London, 1818, p. v.

[28] See Nicoll, p. 9, on Charles' intimacy with the stage.

two proprietors, Davenant and Killigrew, were personally familiar to the king. Davenant was a Catholic. The court was not untouched by Catholicism. The king was not altogether unfavorably disposed to it, at least personally.

The performance at this time of a play such as *Doctor Faustus* with so notable an element of anti-Catholicism in it would hardly have recommended itself. Besides the satire on the Roman court and on Catholic personages, it should be noticed that the Pope's charges against Bruno are, probably intentionally, phrased in a manner which could have been rather provocative to Anglicanism — matters Charles hardly wished to have brought to popular notice at the time. Again, anti-Papalism by some usage had associated itself with the Commonwealth. Anything that suggested the playing of Protestantism against Catholicism, that implied an association with the Commonwealth viewpoint, would have proved, at the time, a precarious course, certainly one which the king's partisans would have avoided. In the Restoration, Dryden and Davenant [29] were reminded, on occasion, of their Commonwealth literary and dramatic productions.

Finally, any doubt that this attitude would apply itself directly and practically will be removed by a reading of the grant of King Charles to Davenant and Killigrew on Aug. 21, 1660.[30] After cautioning them against acting anything " Containing any Matter of Prophanation, Scurrility or Obscenity," the document continues:

> And wee doe further Hereby authorize and Command them the said Thomas Killigrew and Sir William Davenant, to peruse all playes that have been formerly written, and to expunge all Prophanenesse and Scurrility from the same, before they be represented or Acted.

And the cases of Wilson's *The Cheats* [31] and Shadwell's

[29] See Nicoll, p. 276, and J. Q. Adams, *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert,* pp. 122-3.

[30] Adams, p. 88. The grant to Jolly also contains a general warning; *cf.* Hotson, p. 178. Herbert once asked that old plays at the Cockpit be sent to him for expurgation; *cf.* Adams, p. 94.

[31] See F. S. Boas, " Stage Censorship Under Charles II," in *Shakespeare and the Universities.* The king may have been placating the dissenters or avoiding all possible religious trouble or offence; the reference to Rome in 3.3 possesses apparent political significance.

Lancaster Witches,[32] among others, show that this admonition was not taken lightly or forgotten.

This combination of political, religious, and theatrical circumstances, then, would seem to explain the transposition of the Roman scenes from the Papal court to the neutral ground of the Emperor's palace at Babylon, a locality that implied a well defined and, during the Commonwealth, scarcely humorous association. Certainly this was the version performed before the king in 1675, by the Duke of York's Men, three years after their patron had announced his adherence to Catholicism.

With almost equal certainty we may assume that the text of the new scenes when played by the Duke's Men was not the frequently senseless garbling printed in 1663. The aim of the adapter was apparently at first to utilize as much of the original material as possible. The new scene divides itself into four sections: the first (1-59) is based largely on the original text and extends up to Solamaine's entrance; the second (60-107), introduced by the emperor's speech, with the narrative of the capture of Malta by the two Bashawes, Caleph and Mustapha, is based upon various portions of the *Jew of Malta*; the third (108-196), introduced by Solamaine's second speech in which he orders a banquet and sends for the empress, is based freely upon the second scene of the original act; the fourth (197-232), beginning with the entrance of the Conjurer, forms an episode, containing a conjuring lyric, of a farcical type, not unlike the climax of the original scene.

If it is granted that the adapter wished to use as much of the existing text as possible, his deviations are puzzling. Incorrect verse-lining and substitution of words appear at once. A comparison of the first three lines of the original and the opening of the new scene might be instanced:

> *Faust.* Having now, my good Mephistophilis,
> Pass'd with delight the stately town of Trier,
> Environ'd round with airy mountain-tops . . .

This has become,

[32] See *The Complete Works of Thomas Shadwell*, ed. Summers, 1. clxviii ff.; 4. 99-101. Summers thinks no plays of this type were publicly presented, *cf.* 1, pp. clxxix-clxxx. Crowne's *1 Henry the Sixth* (1681) was suppressed for anti-Catholicism; James even acted against *The Spanish Friar*; cf. Nicoll, pp. 10-11.

Faust. Now,
Mephostophilis
Having past with delight the famous
Town of *Tyre*, environ'd round with Aiery
Mountain-tops . . .

The substitution of words, "famous" for "stately," and "Tyre" for "Trier," hints at a confused memory rather than carelessness. The rest of the descriptive speech is excised and the visit to Rome is merely related; only the references, and in a garbled form, to S. Angelo, the gates, and Caesar's "pyramides" are retained. With the second speech of Faustus begins a close parallel with the original, extending to the entrance of the emperor.[33] The "proud Pope" becomes the "proud Turk," and the Cardinals, on whose heads the horns are to be clapt, become, textually, one Bashawe. The Friars with "shaven crowns" are made Bashawes with "shaven pates." The lyric with which Mephistophilis makes Faustus invisible (3. 2. 15-23), has some curious variations. The third line reads, "First wear this girdle then appear," and is now given, "Take this girdle, thou shalt appear." A superfluous "and" disrupts the meter of the fifth line, and "charmes" is given for "spells" in the eighth. At 3. 2. 29 of the original the Pope welcomes the Cardinals; but in the new version Solamaine welcomes Mephistophilis "from the siege of Malta," apparently a slip for "Bashawes."[34]

The borrowing from the *Jew of Malta* begins loosely with the first speech of the emperor and extends up to the second; it is likewise inaccurate and is generally free, as it covers more action. Two characters, Caleph and Mustapha, relate the story of the siege. In Caleph's speech the tribute is but ten months overdue, whereas in the play it is ten years.[35] The statement

[33] The relation of the new and original texts for this first section stands: 1-5, 1-3; 5-10, 31-46; 13-17, 53-7; 20-1, 65-6; 22-7, 69-73; 28-35, 76-82; 35-8, 86-9; 40-59, 2. 9-27. The relationship is of two kinds: one in which the passage might have been lifted entire, the other in which a paraphrase was called for. The first, however, is never much more than a bare restatement of the idea in words that approximate, but do not reproduce, the original diction. Note the repetition, except for Rome and Trier, in the first speeches of Faustus and Mephistophilis.

[34] "Bashawes" also makes the line metrical. If the emperor did address Mephistophilis or Faustus they must have assumed disguises as in the original where they appear as cardinals.

[35] *The Jew of Malta*, ed. H. S. Bennett, 1. 2. 7, 19, etc.

about the expiration of the month's time and the arrival of Martin Del Bosco, here "Martine Belbosco," is not exactly borne out.[36] The siege of Malta is described from the Turkish viewpoint. Caleph hands over the narrative to Mustapha, for at the time of the "chance" that led to the capture he was "sent upon another design." Mustapha tells of the discovery of Barabas.[37] The description of him as speechless and seemingly dead is scarcely consistent, for in the play he speaks to the Turks at once. The last lines of Mustapha's speech paraphrase closely the promise of Barabas to the Turks.[38] Here, of course, it has become an actuality.

The third section, with the invisible Faustus' trickery, is inspired by the dish-snatching and buffeting in the second scene of the original act. The only lines which approximate the original text are those which begin the speech of Solamaine, "Hell, Furies, traytors," paraphrasing the Pope's words.[39] The emperor now calls for music, as the Pope called for the dirge, and then for his "Majecian," who projects the final episode.

The curious fact about the borrowing from the *Jew of Malta* is that it presupposes an outcome not warranted by the play. There was really no final Turkish victory, no occasion for the report of the two Bashawes, for the festivities of the emperor. The occasion in the original was St. Peter's feast, rendered more solemn by the "Pope's triumphant victory."[40] At first it might seem that such a use of the play indicates that the adapter had no close acquaintance with it. On the other hand, it may rather be indicative of the influence of Davenant's popular *Siege of Rhodes*, in which Solyman is victorious. The continuation of his career of conquest, through his lieutenant Mustapha, at the cost of the conclusion of Marlowe's drama, seems a possibility. The idea, at any rate, the Turkish capture of a Christian island, is the theme of Davenant's play, and is here transferred, upon some grounds and with some violence, to Marlowe's Malta.

The relationship with the two plays might be examined more closely. Marlowe's *Jew of Malta* has two references to the conquest of Rhodes.[41] The second, the admonition of Del

[36] *Ibid.* 2. 2.
[37] *Ibid.* 5. 1. 69 ff.
[38] *Ibid.* 5. 1. 91-7.
[39] *Doctor Faustus* 3. 2. 76-8.
[40] *Ibid.*, 3. 1. 53-7, 199-202.
[41] 1. 2. 2-4; 2. 2. 30-2.

Bosco to the governor, is certainly suggestive. Again, Selim Calymanth's expectation of returning, after the apparent capture of Malta, to his father, "great Ottoman," is twice mentioned.[42] A scene at the Turkish court may likewise have been suggested by *Doctor Faustus:* Marlowe, following the itinerary in his source, has Mephistophilis, after the scene at Rome, inform Robin that the conjuring has made him come from Constantinople and on leaving announces his destination as the "Great Turk's Court."[43]

In the present material, two Bashawes, Mustapha and Caleph, are reporting the "victory"[44] to Solamaine.[45] In Davenant's play, which does end in a conquest, the Turkish emperor is Solyman; moreover, he has two prominent "bassas," Pirrhus and Mustapha. Caleph, it might be noted, is not a proper name.[46] In the *Jew of Malta*, only once is a bashaw named, and then as Callapine.[47] It should be remembered, too, that the *Siege of Rhodes* was having a spectacular and successful run at the time and was responsible for the subsequent type of siege-play.[48]

The possibility suggests itself that the adapter worked from a copy of the *Jew of Malta* which was defective in the last leaves, those detailing the final catastrophe. This would explain the similarity with the *Siege of Rhodes*, and the rehandling of the Malta story with respect to the outcome. It would presume, also, that the adapter did not know the *Jew of Malta* otherwise. The original suggestion for the use of the siege of Malta certainly derives from Davenant's popular play. The emperor Solamaine,[49] the two Bashawes and

[42] 5. 2. 105-6; 5. 3. 13 ff.

[43] 3. 3B. It is possible the use of Babylon was suggested by the last act of *2 Tamburlaine.*

[44] The idea for a celebration of a victory may have been taken from the original. Note that in the *Siege of Rhodes* Mustapha reports to Solyman the engagement in which Ianthe was captured, part 1, 2. 107 ff.

[45] "Solamaine" is one of the three spellings used.

[46] It may be a mangled form of Calymanth; Calyphas, in *2 Tamburlaine*, is a derivative of Caliph; *cf.* p. 181 of Miss Ellis-Fermor's edition.

[47] 1. 2. 23. A Callapine is the son of Bajazath in *2 Tamburlaine.*

[48] Davenant opened Lincoln's Inn's Fields with the "opera" in 1661; it had, of course, been performed before. For its effect see Louis Wann, "The Oriental in Restoration Drama," University of Wisconsin *Studies* 2 (1918). 163-86. At least seven Restoration plays, including works by Killigrew, Pordage and Durfey, used the siege situation, which became almost common in the next century.

[49] Soliman appears also in Kyd's *Soliman and Perseda* and in the *Mustapha* plays of Greville and Boyle.

the name of one, may also be attributed to it. The adapter wanted a central figure to replace the Pope, one clear of political entanglements. It seems more likely that he was familiar with the Marlowe canon, obtained the idea and the suitable characters from the *Siege of Rhodes*, and worked out the reporting of the "victory" at Malta. He used the characters and a theme well known on the stage at the time; and a story or action he presumed would be unfamiliar. The attitude of the Restoration adapter toward the material in the *Jew of Malta* probably paralleled that of the Elizabethan toward his source material; and he had no scruples about changing the outcome at Malta in order to bring it into line with Davenant's play and his own use of the Turkish emperor as a substitute for the Pope. To paraphrase Dr. Spencer's comment on Otway's *Caius Marius*,[50] this is less a reworking of Marlowe's material "than a bold appropriation of it for new purposes."

The matter of the incorrect verse-lining might be looked at further. It is clear that there is little reason for the disruption of passages transposed entire. Another passage may easily have been taken over as it stood but is printed thus (22-9):

> Thou knowest my good *Mephistophilis,*
> Within eight days we view'd the face of
> Heaven, Earth, and Hell, so high our dragons
> Sword into the skie, that looking downwards,
> The Earth appear'd to me in quantity
> No bigger than my hand.
> Then in this shew let me an actor be,
> That the proud *Turk* may *Faustus* cunning see.

This stands in the original text (3. 1. 69-77):

> Thou know'st within the compass of eight days
> We view'd the face of heaven, of earth and hell.
> So high our dragons soar'd into the air,
> That looking down, the earth appear'd to me
> No bigger than my hand in quantity.
> There did we view the kingdoms of the world.
> And what might please mine eye, I there beheld,
> Then in this show let me an actor be,
> That this proud Pope may Faustus' cunning see.

[50] *Shakespeare Improved*, p. 293. When Penley prepared a text of the *Jew of Malta* for Kean in 1818, he inserted passages from *Edward II*; cf. Brooke, "The Reputation of Christopher Marlowe," p. 398 ff.

The differences need not be commented upon. But in the original this poetic passage is part of Faustus' request; it is introduced by two lines, omitted here, and these are continued in lines 74 and 75, which give point to the speech. In the 1663 version the idea behind the words is gone and only the garbled poetry set down. If other sections supplied by the adapter and apparently meant as blank verse [51] are looked at with the treatment of the Marlovian passages in mind, it is fair to assume that his work was of a higher order than is revealed by the printed version. The speech of Mephistophilis, at the conclusion of the third section, may be cited with a better verse-lining indicated. It has no definite equivalent in the original text and stands thus (176-196) :

> Because thou art ours & sold to Lucifer, / and I
> Have promis'd to serve thee faithfully, / I'le not
> Conceal the secrets of our state / from thee, thou darling
> Of great *Lucifer*: / Know all those rights and
> Spells which mortals use / to make us rise,
> Appear visible, / answer to their demands,
> Fulfill their wills, / and execute their malice on
> Their enemies, / are very fables, forg'd at first
> In hell, / and thrust on credulous mortals
> To deceive 'm. /
> Nor is there such a power in signes & words, / to
> Make us to obey; that rule the elements, / & in a
> Moment, if we had but leave, / would turn the
> World to a confus'd nothing, / 'tis true we seem
> To come constrain'd, and by / the power of their
> Charmes: but are more willing / to be imploy'd to
> Hurt & kill mankind, / then they are willing to engage
> Vs in / their service, and wheresoe'r we find one bent / to our
> Familiarity, we fly / then willingly to catch him.

Except for the hypothetical sixth and fourteenth lines, the scansion becomes decidedly more regular. There is evidently some garbling beginning with the twelfth line; something has probably been omitted.[52] The use of the symbol for " and " seems to point to a hurriedly written script. If the treatment

[51] The fact that the typographical set up, which must be ignored, gives the appearance of verse is not of great significance. Mr. Sykes found in *The Famous Victories* scenes similarly printed " which one may search from end to end without finding a decently rhythmical passage." H. D. Sykes, *Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama*, p. 53.

[52] The last lines quoted here may echo 1. 3. 49-51.

of the vocabulary is at all paralleled by that in the passages borrowed from the original text, certainly something more like blank verse may be posited. It seems plausible, then, to suggest that at one time this original passage possessed the regularity of the lines lifted from the Marlovian text. And to claim that the verse-lining, as it stands in the printed quarto, is the result of the transmission of the text rather than the ineptness of the adapter. The foundations that seem very plausible are either a stenographic report or a player's memory. If the use of the oriental locale, as Mr. Wann pointed out,[53] associated itself with lengthy and descriptive stage directions, their absence here would contribute to the latter theory. Some peculiarities of the passages taken over from the original text, as the fumbling for and substitution of words, the tendency to paraphrase, may also point to this mode of transmission.[54]

In the passage in which the rearrangement was attempted, it was not necessary to go to the lengths the restoration of the section taken from the original text would demand. With a few transpositions and suppressions, justifiable by the treatment of the Marlovian passages, a new verse-lining could be achieved, as in that section, for example, beginning (61 ff.) :

> And though we use no great familiarity
> Towards our Vassals . . .

The rhythm and the twisted structure of a blank verse is also recognizable elsewhere. The state in which the text appears bears certain marks of similarity with that of the *Henry VI* quartos elucidated by Mr. Alexander.[55]

[53] *Op. cit.*, pp. 184-5. The use of music, which Solamaine calls for, is characteristic; there is no entrance for the empress. Nor do the "triumphs of the Turks," which Mephistophilis and Faustus expect (30-1), pass their way, as the Pope's triumph did. The confusion of Mephistophilis with the Bashawes has been noted. The text as printed is probably unplayable; hence the insistence here upon the play-house "book."

[54] The fact that the title page refers to no company or theater should be noted in connection with these circumstances. The fact that an expurgated scene was printed seems to point to surreptitious transmission from the theater; Wilson's and Shadwell's plays were printed unexpurgated. The desire to print the new scene in this case was probably connected with the vogue of the *Siege of Rhodes*. But Gilbertson certainly might have merely reissued his copy with the original scenes, and silently taken advantage of the recent staging.

[55] Peter Alexander, *Shakespeare's Henry VI and Richard III*. Further evidence for the publisher's having secured from the theater the new scenes is offered by the contradictions in subsequent and in previous matter. Thus the Chorus to 3, and

With regard to the case in hand, the transmission of the quarto text is linked with the publisher rather than with a strolling Commonwealth company. The history of the ownership of the play after the inception of the Commonwealth is quite normal. John Wright had published " without Newgate, at the sign of the Bible," the seven editions between 1609 and 1631. According to the *Stationers' Register*,[56] on June 27, 1646, *Doctor Faustus* was among a number of works transferred by John to his brother Edward Wright.[57] Third in a list of books is " *The tragecall history of the life & death of Doctor Ffaustus*," described as " a play." On April 4, 1655, the play appears in another group of works transferred to William Gilbertson,[58] who issued the 1663 quarto from John Wright's office. The entry reads, " *The tragicall history of ye horrible life & death of D^r Faustus*, by C. M." Curiously enough, the play turns up in another group, entered on the same date, but listed on the next page.[59] Here it is, " A play called, *The Tragicall history of the life & death of Doctor Faustus*." As the epithet " horrible " was dropped with the 1616 edition, there were presumably, copies of the A and B quartos in the office which had become inadvertently listed. Gilbertson's executors, on April 18, 1666,[60] transferred the play to Robert White.

Mr. Brooke apparently believes that the 1663 text was set up from a copy used by the strolling players. The suggestion made here, that the legal owner of the copyright took advantage of the performance " with new additions," is at variance with his conjecture. The initiative in the printing certainly would have come from the owner, not the players; and the condition of the " new additions " seems to indicate that it did.

Wagner's lines in 2, between scenes 1 and 2 (Boas, p. 88), foreshadow the Roman scene; there are references to it in 4.1 and 2B; the references to the visit to the " Great Turk's Court " at Constantinople, in 3.3B, have been mentioned. They are practically meaningless in the 1663 quarto, and were probably not spoken on the stage.

[56] *The Stationers' Register*, Eyre-Rivington transcript, 1640-1708.

[57] E. 42.

[58] E. 340.

[59] E. 341. Of plays he acquired at this date he published in 1657 *The Shoemaker's Holiday*, in 1655 *The Merry Devil of Edmonton*, acquired from Mistress Falconer; *cf.* W. W. Greg, *A List of English Plays Written before 1643 and printed before 1700*.

[60] F. 314.

The publisher was probably aware that the old third act was excised, that a new oriental scene replaced it, and found a way to obtain a transcript of the added material.[61] He apparently did not recognize that it was based in part upon his own copy; or if he did, he did not trouble to correct or collate what he had secured. Gilbertson was clearly not a publisher of much repute. Most of his activity had been with Wright and others in the printing of ballads during the Commonwealth. The circumstance of his ownership of the copyright is quite normal; and the obvious reason for deviation from his material was very likely a production "with new additions" of probably a popular type. The affinities of his text with the 1631 edition can be seen in the reproduction of twelve of its original errors.

The expurgations, a practice going on since 1616, upon which Mr. Brooke bases his suggestion for a Commonwealth origin, would not be out of the publisher's scope. Just how the practice was carried on between 1616 and 1631 we can not definitely say. Gilbertson may have taken a cue from the stage. On the other hand, preparations may have been made for a Commonwealth edition, or it is even possible that an intermediary printing was made.[62] However, as has been pointed out, the practice was not unknown during the Restoration.

The printing of the quarto offers a curious bibliographical problem. Heinemann remarked that:

> A to D were probably printed at an earlier date than the rest. They are got up in an inferior style, and the spelling varies on several occasions from that of the latter part. While sheets A to D spell "Tragicall" in the Headings of the pages, Sheets E to end

[61] Whether there were other extensive changes, besides the probable excision of contradictory references mentioned before, one can not say. The expansion of 4. 6 was to facilitate an actor or actress with a voice In the garbled passages lifted from the original text there is at least one reading from a quarto earlier than 1631. B_4 and B_5 (Mr. Boas' textual commentary is incorrect here) omit "round" at 3. 1. 3, which appears in 1663 at line 4; of less significance is the use of "it" at line 37, which B_2-B_5 had dropped. However, the "cunning" correction, made in B_4 and B_5, is used at lines 29, 33. If the two restorations possess any significance they indicate that the adapter used a quarto different from the printer's.

[62] William Heinemann in "An Essay Towards a Bibliography of Marlowe's *Tragical History of Doctor Faustus*," *The Bibliographer* 6 (June–Nov., 1884), p. 15, mentions continental references to editions of 1636 and 1651 and a later issue in 1690. The 1651 seems to derive from Franz Peter's *Lit. der Faustsage* (Leipsig, 1851); *cf.* Breymann, p. xiii.

have "Tragical." On p. C2 (I) "Faustus" is four times printed with a Gothic ff.[63]

There are other features which he passes over. *The Tragical History* and *of Doctor Faustus* appear on the verso and recto, respectively; this is reversed with H, the recto carrying the first part and the verso the second. H and H_2, moreover, are not cognate. Signatures E, F, and apparently D, have the same watermarking; G is differently marked; H and H_2 differ again from E, F, and G. E_3 and F_3 are signed — the only instances.[64]

Each of these typographical section, A-D and E-H_2, contains complete one of the two separate additions. As this is probably the first printing in Roman type, a new setting was called for. The situation would seem to indicate a division between two printers. No obvious reason for this in a work of this size suggests itself, unless, as Heinemann thinks, there was a delay after the printing of the first part. This may have been caused by the expectancy of additional material from the theater.

Francke, who edited Mountfort's farce adaptation, suggested[65] that Mountfort had used the last published quarto that of 1663, for his adaptation. His use of this quarto is made certain by the fact that a number of passages lifted from Marlowe contain the expurgations of this Restoration text. "Heaven" appears for "God" on some seven occasions.[66] The speech of the Good Angel, which was reduced in 1663 from four lines to two, is given verbatim.[67] Other features reproduced are the substitution of several words.[68] The oaths canceled in the quarto do not appear in Mountfort's version.[69]

There are four instances, however, where the 1663 changes are not retained.[70] None of these is significant enough to

[63] *Op. cit.*, p. 15.

[64] Bibliographical details furnished by Dr. McManaway.

[65] *The Life and Death of Doctor Faustus*, Heilbronn, 1886, p. xxxvi.

[66] 1663 quarto, 2. 2. 12, Mountford, 290; 2. 2. 15, M. 294; 2. 2. 95, M. 310; 5. 2. 55, M. 812; 5. 2. 65, M. 817; 5. 2. 66, M. 818. At 2. 2. 94 "heaven" replaces "Christ," Mountfort, 308.

[67] 1. 1. 71-4, 9-10.

[68] "Bands" for "ruffs" at 4. 2B. 118, M. 713; "struck" for "strike," 4. 3. 44, M. 730; "hopes" for "hope," 5. 2. 91, M. 834.

[69] 4. 2B. 103, M. 705; 4. 2B. 91, M. 699; 4. 3. 67, M. 736.

[70] "Himself" at 2. 1. 55, M. 133; "the bill," 2. 1. 65, M. 140; "wonderful," 4.

warrant the belief they were not made by Mountfort. In view of the other evidence, there is nothing on which one might argue against his use of the quarto.

In summary, then, this "improvement" of *Doctor Faustus* seems to have been the version known on the Restoration stage from the performances of 1662 to Mountfort's farce adaptation in 1686. The preponderance of evidence is against the conjecture of a Commonwealth origin for the new material. On the one hand, the political-religious implications of the Roman scene and, on the other, the mollifying attitude of a court not unfavorably disposed toward Catholicism [71] and always interested in the theater, are the factors influencing the revision. Textual and bibliographical evidence seems to indicate that the unfortunate garbling of the new episode is the result of the probably surreptitious transmission of the text from the theater to the publisher. Its condition does not permit anything like a serious critical appraisal. The "improvement" need cause no surprise or condemnation as, first, the material excised is very doubtfully Marlowe's. And second, as the play had adjusted itself to and exploited a popular political sentiment before the Commonwealth, when the feeling was reversed in the Restoration the effect could be expected to make itself felt.

Baltimore

2B. 74, M. 692; "lost," 5. 2. 139, M. 860. An instance of his rehandling of the 1663 text at 2. 2. 15 ff. occurs at M. 290-5.

[71] The sentiment of these early years Mr. Nicoll points out (p. 11) was "violently monarchist, but later the indecision of the court in regard to religion led to a definite break of the dramatists into two camps. . . ." He sets the first era of the political-religious controversy between 1679 and 1685.

VITA

Richard Henry Perkinson, the writer of this dissertation, was born at Saint Louis on July 25, 1905. He attended the high schools of Chaminade College and of Saint Louis University, was graduated from the latter in 1925, and spent the years 1926-28 in Europe. He received the baccalaureate degree from Saint Louis University in February, 1931, and the degree of Master of Arts in February, 1932, after which he entered the Johns Hopkins University, taking the doctorate in June, 1936. In the fall of 1935, he became instructor in the Graduate School of Fordham University.